<u>REMARKS</u>

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-11 remain pending, with claims 1 and 9-11 being independent. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9-11 have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed disclosure. Thus, Applicant submits that the amendments do not include new matter.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 9-11 are rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by <u>Nagashima</u> (U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0122202). Claims 3-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Nagashima</u> in view of <u>Ett</u> (U.S. Patent No. 5,227,893).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9-11 to clarify features of the invention not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. To this end, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentably distinguishable from the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an image processing apparatus comprising, <u>inter alia</u>, first and second input units configured to input two different types of data, namely application data and print data generated by converting the application data. Claim 1 also recites a registration unit configured to register the application data and print data. The claim further recites a selecting unit and control unit for effecting different processing for the application data and the print data. More specifically, claim 1 recites that the selecting unit selects the application

8

data, but not the print data, when a specific index is input by an index input unit and a transmitting unit is designated by a designation unit. Further, the selecting unit selects the print data, but not the application data, when a specific index is input by the index unit and a printing unit is designated by the designation unit. Still further, the control unit controls the transmitting unit and the printing unit when the selecting unit selects the application data and the printing data, respectively. Thus, in sum, the information processing apparatus accepts two types of data, namely the application data and print data, and effects different processing for the application data and print data, namely through a transmitting unit for the application data and a printing unit for the print data.

Amended independent claims 9-11 recite an image processing method and computer-related programs that include features analogous to those recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Office Action cites <u>Nagashima</u> as disclosing some of the features of the invention.

In Applicant's view, <u>Nagashima</u> discloses a process in which a client generates print data on which a cover sheet is attached, and transmits the generated print data to a printer, which in turn may provide a facsimile communication to another printer. See, e.g., paragraph 0082.

The Office Action generally cites the process shown and described in conjunction with Figure 3 of <u>Nagashima</u> as anticipating the claimed input of data.

Applicant submits, however, that the process shown in Figure 3 of <u>Nagashima</u> merely shows how a coversheet is produced and printed. See, e.g., paragraph 0032. As such, the process shown in this figure represents generating the print data for printing the coversheet by a

printer. This process does not include the inputting in an information processing apparatus of distinct application and print data, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Further, Applicant submits that Nagashima does not disclose or suggest a registration unit for registering distinct application data and print data. In this regard, it should be noted that Figure 2 of Nagashima merely demonstrates one type of stored data, namely registration files, in a database. See paragraphs 0056 and 0061. This registration data represents coversheet templates. Paragraph 0061. As such, the "registration files A and B" of Nagashima represent the same type of data, and as such, cannot be understood to anticipate or suggest the distinctly claimed application data and print data that are input and registered in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

The Office Action further cites the process shown and described in conjunction with Figure 5 of Nagashima as anticipating the claimed selecting and control units/steps.

Applicant submits, however, that the process shown in Figure 5 of Nagashima is directed to a printing process carried out by a coversheet generating section. Paragraph 0034. As such, the process cannot be understood to anticipate the claimed selection unit or steps, that include selecting "the application data, *but not the print data*," in accordance with a specific index and a designated transmission unit or step, as recited in independent claims 1 and 9-11. Nor could the process shown in Figure of Nagashima be understood as controlling a "transmission unit" in addition to a "printing unit," as further recited in independent claims 1 and 9-11.

In sum, Applicant submits that Nagashima does not disclose or suggest an information processing apparatus, method, or computer-related program, that accepts two types of data, namely the application data and print data, and effects different processing for the application

data and print data, namely through a transmitting unit for the application data and a printing unit for the print data, as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11.

Applicant further submits that the secondary citation to Ett fails to cure the deficiencies of Nagashima. In Applicant's view, Ett generally discloses an arrangement wherein a personal computer-based facsimile unit performs routing of an image to a recipient image station using Pseudo Bar Code information in the image. Col. 6, lines 4-30. However, Ett does not disclose or suggest the features of amended independent claims 1 and 9-11 that are not found in Nagashima, as described above.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the invention recited in amended independent claims 1 and 9-11 is patentably distinguishable from references cited in the Office Action.

The dependent claims should also be deemed allowable, in their own right, for defining other patentable features of the present invention in addition to those recited in the independent claims. Applicant requests further individual consideration of these dependent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the application are earnestly solicited.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr./

Donald H. Heckenberg, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 60,081

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3839548_1

12